



Republic of Malawi

**Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR) of UNEP Subcommittee
meeting
31st October 2023**

**Intervention on behalf of Malawi by Mr. Mapopa C. Kaunda, Deputy
Permanent Representative (DPR) to UNEP on agenda item 2; UNEA-6
assessment and lessons learned**

1. Mr. Chair, Excellencies and Colleagues, Executive Director, good morning.
2. I want to thank the Executive Director and her team for the excellent and very useful document informing our discussion today. Thank you Ulf for your introduction of this item.
3. By any stretch of imagination, any UNEA session is a complex and complicated affair. Not only in terms of highly competing interests, intense negotiations and the nature of administrative and logistical arrangements.
4. Mr. Chair, before I proceed, having noted the experiences of colleagues from the African region in obtaining visas to attend some ongoing meetings, I want to use the opportunity to thank Kenya for providing conducive and flexible entry conditions into their territory for delegations to UNEP Meeting. Kenya is indeed the environmental headquarters that they deserve to be.

5. Having said that allow me to make some preliminary general and specific comments on the Document prepared by the Secretariat.

In terms of general comments,

- i. Our view is that ultimately outcomes of UNEA sessions should be incremental, complementary and responsive to pertinent and emerging environmental actions and challenges;
- ii. Members need to balance ambition of outcomes and ambitious outcomes with the reality informed by national circumstances and priorities as well as political imperatives. Politics is as critical as science.
- iii. Members must make optimal use of the intersessional period, in order to facilitate engagement that is meaningful and inclusive.
- iv. Malawi would like caution that in our quest to be efficient and effective, we should avoid being too prescriptive and allow member states the latitude that they own. We should avoid impinging upon member states' creativity and the potential for diversity. my delegation will speak more to this in the comments on specific paragraphs.

6. In terms of comments referencing to specific sections or paragraphs, we want to highlight the following;

- i. Malawi takes note with appreciation, the emphasis in paragraph 5 of the role and contribution that regional ministerial environmental forums and regional stakeholders played in the preparations for UNEA 6. In the same vein, Malawi appreciates highlighting the role and contribution by the second Global Youth Environmental Assembly.

- ii. Malawi takes with appreciation the mention in paragraph 15 (d) of the outcome regarding the agenda item, 'Cooperation with MEAs'. My delegation believes that this outcome augurs very well with the adoption of resolutions UNEA 6/4 and UNEA 6/6;
- iii. While agreeing with paragraph 17 (a) that we must endeavour for a short, action-oriented and ambitious ministerial declaration, my delegation wants to reiterate our caution that this must not be at the expense of inclusivity and diversity. Indeed, by virtue of mentioning the viability of regional fora, where existing and relevant regional, in contributing to the ministerial declaration, serves to buttress the previously mentioned point.
- iv. In paragraph 17 (e), Malawi agrees that the Secretariat should organise, interactive dialogues, without pre-established list of speakers. My delegation is aware that some member states have intense engagement with Secretariat for preferential consideration. And we do not begrudge that. However, this tends to create the impression that some MS's have established preferential treatment.
- v. Regarding paragraphs 18-28, my delegation wants to acknowledge and congratulate the CPR for robust and well-organised preparations for UNEA 6. We take specific note of the efforts that were put into making technical arrangements and support for draft resolutions.
- vi. While Malawi is not strongly opposed to the idea of prioritising discussion on operative paragraphs while avoiding spending more time on preambular paragraphs as stated in paragraph 32 (iv), as we believe it is a practical idea, we would like however to allow for more engagement on this idea, in order to benefit from the diversity of practices and experiences. You may recall that during the Cluster discussions at UNEA 6, principle did generate robust debate.

vii. My delegation takes note with interest, in paragraph 34, that continuing negotiations and reaching agreement outside of the OECPR and Committee of the Whole, was unprecedented. We believe that it was unprecedented in terms of practice rather than the rules of procedure or practice. That said it was something that had to be done to enable adoption of five other resolutions. Of course this is at the expense of having some draft resolutions not being translated into all six UN languages. But here we want to pose a question; does the COW have to rise on the Wednesday of the UNEA week, or it is possible to push it Thursday?

viii. In the chapeau of paragraph 38, we are not in support of the use of the language and I quote ‘strategic and high-quality’ unquote, when referring to draft resolutions. This is not only presumptuous from the point of view of whomever, makes such a remark, but it is also disrespectful to the capacities, capabilities, efforts and dedication of member states who sponsor resolutions. We therefore request that this language, without exception, be deleted and should not appear in UNEP official documents.

ix. Malawi wants to support, with much appreciation, the proposed additional guidelines in paragraph 38 (f) on submissions of draft resolutions. We believe these guidelines could facilitate submission, engagement and agreement on draft resolutions. But having said that, this should not be seen as being further prescriptive and restrictive on the sovereign right to submit draft resolutions.

x. My delegation supports making optimal use of the intersessional period as it has been pointed out in paragraph 38 (h). In addition to the four elements in roman numeral i-iv in the same paragraph, we would like to add a point on Putting discussion on draft resolutions as agenda items as running agenda items for subcommittee meetings post Annual subcommittee meeting;

- xi. The use of co-facilitators is becoming an established and accepted practice. We believe that it is a good organisation of work arrangement for UNEP purposes. This is why we support efforts that would enable the identification of and facilitate the work of co-facilitators, as outlined in paragraph 38 (j). Having said that we do not support the idea of taking away the agency of identifying co-facilitators from regional groups as suggested in paragraph 38 h (iii); we believe that at the end of the day, regional groups have to a large extent, the mechanisms to facilitate identification of co-facilitators, at whatever point in time that is as convenient as possible to the process.
- xii. On paragraph 42, Malawi has taken note, with appreciation, of the list of financial contributions that enabled participation by developing countries and major groups. We take particular note of the contributions by some member states from the global south. We would like to call for a recommendation that encourages contributions from all parties that are able to as well as from other stakeholders, who could in addition contribute in non-financial ways.
- xiii. While appreciating the recommendation 55 (b) that invite Chairs of regional ministerial forums, we would like to add a recommendation that the Executive Director of UNEP should make it part of her annual plans to participate in these high-level regional environmental forums.

7. As I conclude, I want to emphasise that Malawi is in general support of the process of drawing up lessons and developing recommendations that are consensually acceptable to all members, while taking into account the input by other stakeholders.

8. I thank you all for your kind attention.